

## MINUTES

### CITY PLAN COMMISSION/ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

OCTOBER 19, 2015

The City Plan Commission/Architectural Review Board of the City of Clayton, Missouri, met upon the above date at 5:30 p.m. Upon roll call, the following responded:

Present:

Chairman Steve Lichtenfeld  
Mark Winings, Aldermanic Representative  
Craig Owens, City Manager  
Ron Reim  
Josh Corson  
Sherry Eisenberg  
Pepe Finn

Absent:

None

Also Present:

Louis Clayton, Planner  
Susan M. Istenes, AICP, Planning Director

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked that all cell phone ringers be turned off, that conversations take place outside the meeting room and that those who wish to speak approach the podium and to be sure the green light on the microphone is on for property recording of this meeting.

## MINUTES

The minutes of the October 5<sup>th</sup>, 2015 meeting were approved, after having been previously distributed to each member.

### ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – ADDITION TO SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE – 40 ARUNDEL PLACE

Paul Fendler, project architect, was in attendance at the meeting. He distributed revised plan sets to the members and to staff.

Susan Istenes explained that the 7,882-square-foot site is located on the south side of Arundel Place between DeMun and Skinker Avenues and has a zoning designation of R-2 Single-Family Dwelling District. The existing two-story stone home was constructed in 1920 and measures 2,296

square feet in area. The proposed project consists of the demolition of an existing two-story stone and vinyl siding addition at the rear of the home, and the construction of a 700-square-foot addition in the same general location. The basic massing of the addition is articulated on all sides with windows, doors, accent materials and variations in roof forms. Susan noted that staff finds the revision that was just received acceptable as long as siding doesn't exceed 30-percent of any of the elevations, which appears is not the case.

Mr. Fendler informed the members that they came to an agreement with the Trustees and that he believes everyone is happy with the proposal as revised.

Craig Owens asked if staff includes windows in the calculations when determining material percentages.

Louis Clayton replied "no"; neither are doors.

Chairman Lichtenfeld noted that each elevation now contains less than 30-percent siding.

Being no further questions or comments, Ron Reim made a motion to approve as revised. The motion was seconded by Craig Owens and unanimously approved by the Board.

MODIFICATION TO SIGN ORDINANCE – WALL SIGN – 7750 CARONDELET AVENUE  
(CLAYTON PLAZA HOTEL)

Bill Brink, owner of Classic Sign Services, contractor, was in attendance at the meeting.

Susan Istenes explained that the subject property is located at the southeast corner of South Bemiston Avenue and Carondelet Avenue and contains the Clayton Plaza Hotel (previously known as Crowne Plaza Hotel). On July 14, 2015, after receiving administrative Architectural Review Board approval by the City Manager, the Planning Department issued a Sign Permit for the installation of two identical 35.28-square-foot wall signs on the Carondelet Avenue and Bemiston Avenue facades to replace the two existing 49.56-square-foot Crowne Plaza Hotel signs. On September 16, 2015, staff observed that the signs that were installed were inconsistent with the approved Sign Permit, in that the signs contained logos that were not depicted on the permit plans. The applicant was advised to remove these logos or submit an amendment to the Sign Permit. On September 17, the applicant submitted an amendment to the Sign Permit, and upon review, staff determined that the installed signage exceeded the allowable size per the Sign Regulations. Section 425.040.1 of the Sign Regulations sets the permitted sign size and location based on usage and building type. For hotels, the Sign Regulations permit one wall sign 15 square feet or 5 percent of the front wall area up to a maximum area of 50 square feet. Additionally, buildings on corner lots with display windows and/or a separate street entrance may have a sign on each building elevation with street frontage.

Based on the size of the building, wall signage not to exceed 50 square feet is permitted on both the Bemiston Avenue and the Carondelet Avenue elevations. The signs which were installed are 65.85 square feet each; therefore, a sign modification is being requested to allow the signs to remain. The signs are constructed with blue acrylic channel letters installed on a raceway and are internally lit by LEDs. According to the Sign Regulations, modifications should only be granted due to unusual conditions of the building or site. According to the applicant, the hotel has high auto and pedestrian traffic and needs the branding visibility for the safety of the public. The hotel's vehicles and other signage have the same branding so out of town guests can easily recognize their destination. Staff does not believe the applicant has identified any unusual conditions with the building or site that would warrant an exception to the regulations to allow larger signs than permitted. The signage shown on the Sign Permit plans did not include logos, and were in conformance with the Sign Regulations. The signs were not installed in accordance with approved plans and measure 65.85 square feet each, which is 30 percent larger than the 50 square feet permitted. On April 18, 2005, the Architectural Review Board denied a requested sign modification by Crowne Plaza Hotel to allow the installation of two 66.35 square feet signs in the same location as the existing signs. The signs that were ultimately installed measured 49.56 square feet. Staff is of the opinion that the size of the signs is not compatible with the building they serve or to other nearby signage. The addition of the logos changed the character of the signs which are not consistent with the approved plans that received administrative Architectural Review Board approval. For these reasons, staff does not support the granting of a sign modification and recommends denial.

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked what constitutes the logo; the curved/angled lines; not the lettering?

Louis Clayton replied "yes" the logo is the detailing above and below the words.

Mr. Brink stated that it took him 6 weeks to get the permit and at the last minute, the owner decided to incorporate the logos and he didn't have another 6 weeks to wait so he installed the sign knowing he would end up here. He informed the members that if this Board does not approve the signage as installed, they would ask to simply allow the top logo to remain (they would remove the bottom logo).

Chairman Lichtenfeld questioned if removing the bottom logo would get them below 50 square feet.

Mr. Brink stated that it would be close. He noted that all their other signage has the full logo.

Chairman Lichtenfeld stated he prefers the consistency of both (upper and lower); however, 50 square feet is the maximum allowed and the signage should comply with that.

Ron Reim agreed.

Mr. Brink stated that they could move everything closer together. He stated that some cities deduct the “dead” space from the calculations.

Louis Clayton stated that we do not; we measure the outside perimeter.

Chairman Lichtenfeld suggested leaving it up to the sign designer to come up with a sign that meets the maximum of 50 square feet or revise and come back to this Board for review. He noted that size is the issue here and that he thinks both the top and bottom details are needed for the sign to “work”.

A discussion ensued about the size of the sign and possible ways to reduce its size.

Mark Winings stated that it seems to him that if the bottom detailing were removed, the sign would still be over 50 square feet, although slightly.

Pepe Finn commented that “squishing” the sign may be of consequence and that the top detail looks like a roof.

Mark Winings agreed. He commented that if his measurements are accurate, the sign minus the bottom detailing would be just below 52 square feet. He asked the other members if they would be comfortable approving that size.

Ron Reim asked the Chairman if he is okay with just the top detailing.

Chairman Lichtenfeld replied “no”; he thinks the sign needs both and that he is more concerned with the size.

Craig Owens suggested re-making the sign to make it fit.

Mr. Brink stated that everything could be reduced in size.

Craig Owens asked that the wires be hidden as well.

Mr. Brink stated that the old wires showed as well.

Craig Owens asked that the motion include that the wires be hidden.

Mr. Brink reiterated that at the 9<sup>th</sup> hour the owners said they wanted the logos included and that he didn’t have another 6 weeks to wait for the permit.

Hearing no further questions or comments, Chairman Lichtenfeld called for a motion.

Ron Reim made a motion to approve a maximum 52 square foot sign that either includes or excludes the top and/or bottom detailing (known as the logo) and to conceal the exposed wiring on the west side to be submitted to staff for review and approval [a new permit to be issued]. The motion was seconded by Pepe Finn and unanimously approved by the Board.

#### ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – EXTERIOR ALTERATIONS – COMMERCIAL – 16 SOUTH BEMISTON AVENUE

Whitney Van Zant and his brother, Vin Van Zant, were in attendance at the meeting.

Susan Istenes explained that the subject property is located on the east side of South Bemiston Avenue between Forsyth Boulevard and Carondelet Avenue and has a zoning designation of High Density Commercial District (HDC) and is located in the CBD Overlay Zoning District. The property contains a one-story, gray EIFS and brick commercial building, most recently occupied by Tani Sushi. In conjunction with an interior renovation of the building, the applicant proposes to install reclaimed wood to the front façade and to a small portion of the south side of the building. The southernmost window on the front elevation will be removed and replaced with a garage door window. The size of the window opening will not change. Also proposed are new black canvas awnings, new railing adjacent to the front entry, and a new window on the alley side of the building. Signage shown on the plan is for illustration only and is not being considered at this time. Based on the City's Bicycle Parking Regulations, the proposed use is required to provide one bicycle rack. The Public Works Department has conditionally approved the request to place the required bicycle rack on the public sidewalk in front of the building. Reclaimed wood will be used on the majority of the front façade, significantly changing the building's appearance. Reclaimed wood planks vary in size, color, and texture, and therefore have a rustic appearance. Wood siding is rarely used as a building material in Downtown. In cases where it has been used, it has a contemporary appearance through the use of high-quality hardwood siding with standard sized planks installed in a regular pattern. Staff is of the opinion that the proposed reclaimed wood is not a high quality material, is not compatible with adjacent structures, and is not compatible with the existing gray EIFS and brick that are to remain on the building. The proposed garage door window is the same size as the existing window opening and when closed, will appear much like the existing window. Although no similar examples are found Downtown, there are several examples of window and door systems that open completely thereby creating an open air storefront. Staff is of the opinion that the inclusion of fully operable, retractable window will generate street level activity while having minimal visual impact. Other changes to the building including awning replacement, new railings, and new windows are minor and in staff's opinion are acceptable. Susan stated that staff's recommendation is to deny as requested.

The Van Zants presented a sample of the treated barn wood (tongue and groove) to the members, stating that it comes in standard width and sizes and contains a clear commercial protectant covering.

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked if the planks are typical sized.

Mr. Van Zant indicated that they can be cut to any size. A sample was presented.

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked if they have used this wood at other locations.

Mr. Van Zant indicated that they've used it in Indianapolis and Kansas City.

Susan Istenes asked if it was used inside or outside in Indianapolis.

Mr. Van Zant replied "inside"; noting that their Indianapolis location is a historic district.

Sherry Eisenberg asked if the area is recessed.

Mr. Van Zant indicated that it is recessed slightly.

Josh Corson asked if the wood goes all the way down.

Mr. Van Zant replied "yes".

Josh Corson asked if the trim will remain EIFS.

Mr. Van Zant replied "yes". He stated that the EIFS appears to have been damaged, so they plan to paint all the exposed EIFS a purplish-black color called "Bohemian Black".

Chairman Lichtenfeld noted that sheet AE12 says EIFS to remain as is.

Mr. Van Zant indicated that's what they had planned until they looked at it today.

Josh Corson asked why the two different windows.

Mr. Van Zant indicated that they want to keep the bar area more protected.

Sherry Eisenberg asked what happens around the corner.

Mr. Van Zant stated that there will be a faux beam to match the corner.

A discussion ensued about the windows and/or lack thereof.

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked if the garage door window will allow for walk-up service.

Mr. Van Zant replied "not in this capacity".

Chairman Lichtenfeld noted there are no tables adjacent to that window.

Mr. Van Zant concurred, noting that it is the reception stand. He noted that the awnings will be replaced with logo awnings and that a cup and crown is their symbol in white on a black awning. He then asked about painting the brick to match the EIFS.

Craig Owens asked if there is brick behind the EIFS.

Mr. Van Zant indicated that he believes there is.

Ron Reim commented that nobody knows what the brick looks like underneath.

Chairman Lichtenfeld stated that he has reservations about the use of a black color as it could be depressing. He asked that they reconsider the use of that color.

Mr. Van Zant indicated that he's not sold on that black color anyway, but the white EIFS does not wear well.

Josh Corson stated that he thinks the black would work on the front but not the side.

Chairman Lichtenfeld commented that there would be less black on the front.

Mr. Van Zant presented a picture of the black color as it is used on the interior of another location.

Chairman Lichtenfeld stated that it looks blue.

Mr. Van Zant indicated that it depends on the lighting.

Ron Reim suggested the applicants modify their plans and come back.

Mr. Van Zant asked when they would be able to re-appear before this Board.

Susan Istenes replied "November 16<sup>th</sup>".

Chairman Lichtenfeld agreed with Ron. He stated that there's a difference between what he sees and what is being described.

Craig Owens added that he would like to know what the doors/windows being proposed are as well.

Chairman Lichtenfeld informed the applicants that it is not this Board's intention to delay them; that this Board needs to see the complete "package" as is being requested.

Mr. Van Zant asked if they could be placed on the November 2<sup>nd</sup> agenda.

Susan Istenes indicated that it would be difficult as there are already 7 items on that agenda and a couple of them controversial. She informed the applicants that they can go ahead and pull permits for interior work.

Being no further questions or comments, Ron Reim made a motion to table this application to give the applicant an opportunity to revise the drawings to accurately reflect their proposal. Mark Winings asked if there was anything else to discuss regarding this proposal; for example the wood. No Board member expressed concern or an objection to the use of the wood they are proposing. The motion was seconded by Craig Owens and unanimously approved by the Board.

Craig Owens asked the applicant to provide examples, photos, etc. next time so the members are clear on what's being requested.

#### CITY BUSINESS – STORM WATER PRESENTATION BY PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

Spencer Litteken, the City's Civil Engineer I, began a PowerPoint presentation. The first slide described the "Big Picture", beginning with the EPA, then MODNR, MSD & finally, the city/municipality. Spencer explained that every city is required to participate in Minimum Control Measures (MCM) via the adoption of an Ordinance and a report has to be submitted annually to MSD stating that the required MCM have been followed. A slide depicting the MCM was shown and which ones the City is responsible for.

Josh Corson asked about maintenance.

Spencer indicated that MSD has an inspection program.

Louis Clayton informed the members that the City has recently required site plan recording with the County for projects that include permanent BMPs and that inspections every 3 years to be sure the system is properly operating are required.

Spencer stated that MSD has new legislation regarding water quality standards.

Slides depicting siltation measures were shown.

Spencer indicated that grading and mitigation plans are reviewed by both the Planning and Public Works Departments.

A brief discussion regarding the use of salt during the winter ensued. It was noted that the amount of salt used on the roads has decreased over the years and that the use of salt before the storm lessens the amount needed to be effective.



Spencer indicated that we (the City) receive a report card from MSD and we always pass all 6 categories.

Susan Istenes asked Spencer to explain SWPPP (Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan).

Spencer stated that a SWPPP is required for all project sites that are over 5,000 square feet and a Land Disturbance Permit is also required for all project sites that are 1 acre or more. He stated that MSD reviews all SWPPPs and conducts the inspections.

Chairman Lichtenfeld thanked Spencer for the information.

Spencer stated that changes are coming.

Being no further question or comments, this meeting adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

---

Recording Secretary